

**EXHIBIT A**  
**LISTING UPDATE INFORMATION**

Information	Comments
Company ID	MFSX
CLEC Order Number	MFS order number.
Ameritech Related Number	Ameritech order to associate with MFS order.
Transaction Code	New listing, change, delete, etc. (four digit code).
New Connect Directory	"Y" or "N" to deliver directory immediately.
Completion Date	Date order is effective.
Business/Resident Indicator	"B" or "R"
Record Type	Main/Additional/Caption (M, O, C).
Advance Listing Code	"AVL," if applicable.
Yellow Page Heading Code	Four digit code (business only).
Annual Delivery Quantity	Leave blank if one copy is desired.
Previous Telephone Number	This would only be supplied for new orders.
Referral Telephone Number	This would only be supplied for disconnect orders, if available.
Local Exchange Carrier	Subscriber's former LEC on new order; Subscriber's future LEC on disconnect orders, if available.
Type of Account	Government, school, etc.
List Type	1, 2, 3, 4, 8, A.
Omit From Consumer List	"X" if applicable.
New/Changed Listing Information	Customer name, telephone number, and address.
Current Listing Information	Change order only, used to ensure correct information replaces MFS' current information in the system.
Delivery Information	Complete address for delivery required.

# **AMERITECH WHITE AND YELLOW PAGE LISTINGS ENTRY INFORMATION**

COMPANY ID _____	CLEC ORDER NUMBER _____	AMERITECH RELATED NUMBER _____
TRANSACTION CODE _____	COMPLETION DATE _____	ADVANCE LISTING CODE _____
RECORD TYPE M = MAIN LISTING O = ADDL LISTING C = CAPTION	LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIER _____	BUSINESS = B RESIDENCE = R INDICATOR _____
ANNUAL DELIVERY QUANTITY _____	PREVIOUS TELEPHONE NUMBER _____	YELLOW PAGE HEADING CODE _____
NEW CONNECT DIRECTORY _____	REFERRAL TELEPHONE NO. _____	STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CODE _____
TYPE OF ACCOUNT (CIRCLE ONE IF APPLICABLE) COUNTY    CITY    U.S.    STATE    SCHOOL		

## **MAIN LISTING INFORMATION**

NEW/CHANGED LISTING INFORMATION				CURRENT LISTING INFORMATION			
Telephone No.		List Type:		Telephone No.		List Type:	
Name: _____				Name: _____			
List Address:	House No.:	Directional:		List Address:	House No.:	Directional:	
Street Name:		Thoroughfare:		Street Name:		Thoroughfare:	
Community Name:		Location:	Zip Code:	Community Name:		Location:	Zip Code:
Omit Address From Directory ____				Omit Address From Directory ____			
Tel. No. Phrase: _____				Tel. No. Phrase: _____			
Service Address:	House No.:	Directional:		Service Address:	House No.:	Directional:	
Street Name:		Thoroughfare:		Street Name:		Thoroughfare:	
Community Name:		Location:	Zip Code:	Community Name:		Location:	Zip Code:
Omit From Consumer List ____	Omit From Address Directory ____			Omit From Consumer List ____	Omit from Address Directory ____		

## **BILL INFORMATION (IF DIFFERENT FROM LIST)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Location (Apt., Etc.): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Foreign/Additional Listing Pages Included: \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks/File As Info.: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

\*\*\*\*\*

In the matter of the application of )  
 AMERITECH MICHIGAN for approval of )  
 agreements with MFS INTELENET OF )  
 MICHIGAN, INC., for interconnection of )  
 their telecommunication networks. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. U-11098

At the December 20, 1996 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,  
 Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. John G. Strand, Chairman  
 Hon. John C. Shea, Commissioner  
 Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner

**ORDER APPROVING AMENDED INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENTS**

On May 28, 1996, Ameritech Michigan filed an application requesting approval of a series of agreements between MFS Intelnet of Michigan, Inc., (MFS) and Ameritech Information Industry Services, a division of Ameritech Services, Inc., on behalf of Ameritech Michigan for interconnection of their telecommunication networks, pursuant to Section 203 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act, as amended, MCL 484.2203; MSA 22.1469(203) (MTA), and the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 251 et seq. (FTA). The agreements contained operational terms for physical interconnection, unbundled access to Ameritech Michigan's network, physical collocation, number portability, resale, access to data bases, and a variety of other business relationships.

In an order issued August 22, 1996, the Commission found that portions of the agreements between Ameritech Michigan and MFS had to be rejected. Among other things, the Commission found that Section 17.0 of their interconnection agreement, which is related to interception and referral of calls to a customer's former number, should be rejected for violation of Rule 34 of the Commission's Quality of Service Standards, 1996 AACCS, R 484.34(1).

The Commission also indicated that the rate established in their directory assistance services agreement for home number plan area directory assistance had to be revised so that the agreement would not violate the MTA requirement that access service rates and charges not exceed the rates allowed for the same interstate services by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

The Commission also rejected the listing and directory services agreement from which Ameritech Michigan had redacted certain information. Noting that Section 252 of the FTA included directory listings and directory assistance among services for which an entering local exchange carrier (LEC) has a right to negotiate, the Commission concluded that the complete contract between the parties must be submitted for the Commission's approval and that its terms must be made available on a nondiscriminatory basis to other providers.

On October 8, 1996, Ameritech Michigan filed a motion for approval of amendments to the agreements. In so doing, Ameritech Michigan submitted copies of amendments to the interconnection and directory assistance services agreements. An examination of those documents indicates that Section 17.0 of the original interconnection agreement has been amended to change the period of time for which a referral announcement must be provided to comply with the requirements of Rule 34. The amendment to the interconnection agreement also revises the

provisions of the pricing schedules pertaining to interim number portability. This amendment was negotiated to reflect the FCC's First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which was issued on July 2, 1996.<sup>1</sup> The amended interconnection agreement now provides that each party shall bill the other party for interim number portability at the rate approved by the Commission. The payment of charges for interim number portability shall be deferred until the FCC or the Commission establishes a methodology for recovery of costs to provide interim number portability. Finally, the interconnection agreement provides that any payment resulting therefrom shall be subject to the conditions of applicable FCC and Commission orders.

The directory assistance services agreement was amended to respond to the Commission's finding that the original rates for home number plan area directory assistance could exceed the rates for the same interstate services set forth in applicable FCC tariffs, contrary to Michigan law. The rates for home number plan area directory assistance were amended to be the lesser of either the applicable rates set forth in FCC Tariff No. 2, Section 9 (or any successor provision), or \$0.26 per occurrence.

In response to the Commission's rejection of its original listing and directory services agreement due to the redaction of certain information, Ameritech Michigan submitted a white pages listing and directory services agreement, as well as a comprehensive listing and directory services agreement that was separately filed under confidential protection pursuant to Section 210 of the MTA. Ameritech Michigan maintains that the white pages listings and directory services agreement should be approved by the Commission. However, Ameritech Michigan

---

<sup>1</sup>First Report and Order, In the Matter of Telephone Number Portability, FCC Docket No. 95-116 (July 2, 1996).

contends that nothing in the comprehensive listing and directory services agreement is covered by the FTA. Accordingly, Ameritech Michigan states that it filed the comprehensive listing and directory services agreement for informational purposes only.

The Commission finds that the interconnection, directory assistance services, and white pages listing and directory services agreements filed on October 8, 1996 should be approved, subject to the addition of two provisions. In its November 26, 1996 order in Cases Nos. U-11151 and U-11152, the Commission rejected Ameritech Michigan's position that its interconnection agreement with AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc., (AT&T) does not obligate Ameritech Michigan to include information about AT&T's services, including an address and telephone number for customer service, in the informational pages at the beginning of Ameritech Michigan's directories. It was also determined that Ameritech Michigan is required to agree to deliver white pages directories to AT&T's resale customers without additional charge. The Commission remains persuaded that provisions similar to those approved by the Commission's November 26, 1996 order in Cases Nos. U-11151 and U-11152 as well as related pricing information for these services should be incorporated into Ameritech Michigan's publicly available agreements with MFS for the interconnection of their telecommunications networks. Subject to inclusion of these provisions, the Commission finds that the agreements between Ameritech Michigan and MFS should be approved.

The Commission FINDS that:

a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended by 1995 PA 216, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; MSA 22.1469(101) et seq.; the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 151 et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201

et seq.; MSA 3.560(101) et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 1992 AACRS, R 460.17101 et seq.

b. Subject to inclusion of provisions regarding the incorporation of MFS's customer service information in Ameritech Michigan's informational pages at the beginning of its directories and the delivery of white pages directories to MFS's resale customers without additional charge, the agreements between Ameritech Michigan and MFS for interconnection of their telecommunication networks should be approved.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:**

A. Subject to the inclusion of provisions regarding the inclusion of MFS Intelnet of Michigan, Inc.'s customer service information in Ameritech Michigan's informational pages at the beginning of its directories and the delivery of white pages directories to MFS Intelnet of Michigan, Inc.'s resale customers without additional charge, the agreements between Ameritech Michigan and MFS Intelnet of Michigan, Inc., for interconnection of their telecommunications networks are approved.

B. A complete copy of the agreements between Ameritech Michigan and MFS Intelnet of Michigan, Inc., for interconnection of their telecommunication networks, as approved by the Commission, shall be filed within ten days of the issuance of this order.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26; MSA 22.45.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

( S E A L )

/s/ John G. Strand  
Chairman

I concur in part, and dissent in part,  
as discussed in my separate opinion.

/s/ John C. Shea  
Commissioner

/s/ David A. Svanda  
Commissioner

By its action of December 20, 1996.

/s/ Dorothy Wideman  
Its Executive Secretary



**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

\*\*\*\*\*

In the matter of the application of <b>AMERITECH MICHIGAN</b> for approval of agreements with MFS INTELENET OF <b>MICHIGAN, INC.</b> , for interconnection of their telecommunication networks.	) ) ) ) ) ) )	Case No. U-11098
---	---------------------------------	------------------

**SEPARATE OPINION OF COMMISSIONER JOHN C. SHEA**  
**CONCURRING IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART**

(Submitted on December 20, 1996 concerning order issued on same date.)

I join the majority opinion insofar as it approves Section 17.0 of the agreement at issue here. The remainder of the order either impermissibly relies on authority purportedly conferred on the Commission by the United States Congress instead of the Michigan Legislature or is not based on competent, material and substantial evidence as required by law. I therefore dissent from the remainder of the order.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 John C. Shea, Commissioner